AF/ 2178

PTO/SB/21 (02-04)
Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

OIPE
MAR 03 2004
PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE
BC1800

TRANSMITTAL FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Application Number	09/182,825
Filing Date	10/29/1998
First Named Inventor	TEN KATE
Art Unit	2178
Examiner Name	STEPHEN S. HONG
Total Number of Pages in This Submission: 72	Attorney Docket Number: PHN 16695

ENCLOSURES *(Check all that apply)*

- [x] Fee Transmittal Form
- [ ] Fee Attached
- [ ] Amendment/Reply
- [ ] After Final
- [ ] Affidavits/declaration(s)
- [ ] Extension of Time Request
- [ ] Express Abandonment Request
- [ ] Information Disclosure Statement
- [ ] Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)
- [ ] Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application
- [ ] Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53
- [ ] Drawing(s)
- [ ] Licensing-related Papers
- [ ] Petition
- [ ] Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application
- [ ] Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address
- [ ] Terminal Disclaimer
- [ ] Request for Refund
- [ ] CD, Number of CD(s) _____
- [ ] After Allowance communication to Technology Center (TC)
- [ ] Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
- [x] Appeal Communication to TC **(Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)**
- [ ] Proprietary Information
- [ ] Status Letter
- [x] Other Enclosure(s) (please Identify below):

POSTCARD

Remarks

BRIEF PLUS 2 COPIES
2 aSB

RECEIVED
MAR 0 8 2004
Technology Center 2100

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm or Individual name	ANNE E. BARSCHALL
Signature	/A E Barschall/
Date	03/01/2004

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.

Typed or printed name	ANNE E. BARSCHALL		
Signature	/A E Barschall/	Date	03/01/2004

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. **SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.**

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

PTO/SB/17 (10-03)
Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0032
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

OIPE JC100 MAR 03 2004 PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

FEE TRANSMITTAL for FY 2004

Effective 10/01/2003. Patent fees are subject to annual revision.

☐ Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27

TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT ($) 330

Complete if Known	
Application Number	09/182,825
Filing Date	10/29/1998
First Named Inventor	TENKATE
Examiner Name	STEPHENS. HONG
Art Unit	2178
Attorney Docket No.	PHN 16695

RECEIVED MAR 0 8 2004 Technology Center 2100

METHOD OF PAYMENT *(check all that apply)*

☐ Check ☐ Credit card ☐ Money Order ☐ Other ☐ None

☑ Deposit Account:

Deposit Account Number: 14-1270

Deposit Account Name:

The Director is authorized to: *(check all that apply)*

☑ Charge fee(s) indicated below ☑ Credit any overpayments

☐ Charge any additional fee(s) or any underpayment of fee(s)

☐ Charge fee(s) indicated below, **except for the filing fee** to the above-identified deposit account.

FEE CALCULATION

1. BASIC FILING FEE

Large Entity Fee Code	Large Entity Fee ($)	Small Entity Fee Code	Small Entity Fee ($)	Fee Description	Fee Paid
1001	770	2001	385	Utility filing fee	
1002	340	2002	170	Design filing fee	
1003	530	2003	265	Plant filing fee	
1004	770	2004	385	Reissue filing fee	
1005	160	2005	80	Provisional filing fee	

SUBTOTAL (1) ($)

2. EXTRA CLAIM FEES FOR UTILITY AND REISSUE

	Extra Claims		Fee from below	Fee Paid
Total Claims		-20** =	X	=
Independent Claims		- 3** =	X	=
Multiple Dependent				=

Large Entity Fee Code	Large Entity Fee ($)	Small Entity Fee Code	Small Entity Fee ($)	Fee Description
1202	18	2202	9	Claims in excess of 20
1201	86	2201	43	Independent claims in excess of 3
1203	290	2203	145	Multiple dependent claim, if not paid
1204	86	2204	43	** Reissue independent claims over original patent
1205	18	2205	9	** Reissue claims in excess of 20 and over original patent

SUBTOTAL (2) ($)

**or number previously paid, if greater; For Reissues, see above

FEE CALCULATION (continued)

3. ADDITIONAL FEES

Large Entity Fee Code	Large Entity Fee ($)	Small Entity Fee Code	Small Entity Fee ($)	Fee Description	Fee Paid
1051	130	2051	65	Surcharge - late filing fee or oath	
1052	50	2052	25	Surcharge - late provisional filing fee or cover sheet	
1053	130	1053	130	Non-English specification	
1812	2,520	1812	2,520	For filing a request for *ex parte* reexamination	
1804	920*	1804	920*	Requesting publication of SIR prior to Examiner action	
1805	1,840*	1805	1,840*	Requesting publication of SIR after Examiner action	
1251	110	2251	55	Extension for reply within first month	
1252	420	2252	210	Extension for reply within second month	
1253	950	2253	475	Extension for reply within third month	
1254	1,480	2254	740	Extension for reply within fourth month	
1255	2,010	2255	1,005	Extension for reply within fifth month	
1401	330	2401	165	Notice of Appeal	
1402	330	2402	165	Filing a brief in support of an appeal	330
1403	290	2403	145	Request for oral hearing	
1451	1,510	1451	1,510	Petition to institute a public use proceeding	
1452	110	2452	55	Petition to revive - unavoidable	
1453	1,330	2453	665	Petition to revive - unintentional	
1501	1,330	2501	665	Utility issue fee (or reissue)	
1502	480	2502	240	Design issue fee	
1503	640	2503	320	Plant issue fee	
1460	130	1460	130	Petitions to the Commissioner	
1807	50	1807	50	Processing fee under 37 CFR 1.17(q)	
1806	180	1806	180	Submission of Information Disclosure Stmt	
8021	40	8021	40	Recording each patent assignment per property (times number of properties)	
1809	770	2809	385	Filing a submission after final rejection (37 CFR 1.129(a))	
1810	770	2810	385	For each additional invention to be examined (37 CFR 1.129(b))	
1801	770	2801	385	Request for Continued Examination (RCE)	
1802	900	1802	900	Request for expedited examination of a design application	

Other fee (specify) _____

*Reduced by Basic Filing Fee Paid

SUBTOTAL (3) ($)

SUBMITTED BY

(Complete *(if applicable)*)

Name (Print/Type)	Anne E. Barschall	Registration No. (Attorney/Agent)	31,089	Telephone	914-332-1019
Signature				Date	3/1/2004

WARNING: Information on this form may become public. Credit card information should not be included on this form. Provide credit card information and authorization on PTO-2038.

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.17 and 1.27. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. **SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.**

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

OIPE SC100 MAR 0 3 2004 PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

SC
#24
3-10-04

Patent Application Ser. No.: 09/182,825 Group Art Unit: 2178

Filing Date: 10/29/98 Examiner: STEPHEN S. HONG

Attorney Docket Number PHN 16695 Inventor Name(s): TEN KATE

Title: METHOD FOR CODING A PRESENTATION ...

RECEIVED
MAR 0 8 2004
Technology Center 2100

Honorable Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPEAL BRIEF

Sir:

This is an appeal from the final rejection of Claims 28-44.

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest is Koninklijke Philips Electronics, N.V., a corporation of the Netherlands.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Applicant is not aware of any related appeals or in interferences.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 28-34 stand rejected under 35 USC §101.

Claims 28-32, 34-40, and 42 stand rejected under 35 USC §102 over US Pat. No. 5,892,507 ("Moorby").

03/08/2004 CNGUYEN 00000001 141270 09182825
01 FC:1402 330.00 DA

Claims 33, 41, 43, and 44 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 over Moorby in view of US Pat. No. 5,680,619 ("Gudmondson").

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

The response under rule 116 did not contain an amendment. Therefore, though the argument was not accepted, there is no unentered 116 amendment.

V. SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

The invention relates to storing program information. By "program" is meant the kind of program traditionally shown on TV, though now often shown on other media.

Program portions, in accordance with the invention, are stored including a sub-presentation program segment. Perhaps it is simplest, conceptually, to look at Figure 3, where a sub-presentation program segment is shown at 304 and at 306, though segments are also shown in Figure 2. The segment includes a play-out specification and an interface program segment. Play-out specifications are illustrated in both Figures 2 and 3, but it would be simplest to look at boxes 308, 310, and 312. Program interface segments are also illustrated in both Figures, but again, for simplicity, let us refer only to element 318. The interface program segment includes a reference timing for the playout specification. The reference timing is defined independent of the presentation element. This is illustrated in the figure where the interface program segment is stored separately from the presentation element.

It should be noted that the wording of claims 43 and 44 is slightly different from the wording of the earlier claims. The term "play-out specification" is used to refer to the structure that is separate from the presentation element structure; while in claim 28 the term "sub-

presentation program structure" is used for this, while "play-out specification" is a part of the presentation element. Thus the term "play-out specification" has a different meaning from in the earlier claims. This slightly different use of words does not change that each sub-presentation has at least two structures and that the timing information is stored in a different structure from the presentation element.

VI. THE ISSUES

Is the section 101 rejection correct?

Is the section 102 rejection correct?

Is the section 103 rejection correct?

VII. GROUPING OF THE CLAIMS

The claims do not stand or fall together.

VIII. THE ARGUMENT

Rejection under 35 USC §101

The rejected claims recite the actual program portion stored in a computer readable medium. The Examiner considers that these claims recite printed matter. In making this rejection, the Examiner misconstrues the holding of In re Lowry, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

This case particularly relates to the patentability of stored data structures. The Lowry case does NOT require a data structure claim to recite a functional application in order to be patentable. The claims need only dictate how programs manage information.

> "Nor are the data structures analogous to printed matter. Lowry's ADOs do not represent merely underlying data in a database. ADOs contain both information used by application programs and information regarding their physical interrelationships within a memory. Lowry's claims dictate how application programs manage information. Thus, Lowry's claims define functional characteristics of the memory." 32 USPQ 2d at 1034.

What is required here is a recitation of:

A. Physical interrelationships between information in memory; and/or

B. Dictating how application programs manage information and/or

C. Defining functional characteristics of memory, which can be inferred from A& B together.

Applicants' claim 28 recites:

> 28. A presentation program portion stored on a computer readable medium, said presentation the program portion comprising :
>
> a sub-presentation programs segment comprising:
>
> a presentation element with a play-out specification indicating how the presentation element is to be played; and
>
> an interface program segment defining a reference timing for the play-out specification, wherein the reference timing is defined independent of the presentation element.

This claim recites a physical interrelationship between information in memory, because the sub-presentation program segment comprises both the presentation element and the interface program segment. The claim dictates how an application program is to manage the memory because the timing in the interface program segment tells the application programs running on the computer how to manage the use of the other segment. Thus, as in Lowry, the recitations define functional characteristics of a memory and are therefore patentable.

The other rejected claims similarly contain functional recitations. For instance claim 29 recites as follows:

> 29. The presentation program portion of claim 28, wherein the sub-presentation program segment comprises a sequence of presentation elements which are programmed to be presented one after the other.

Again, this claim dictates how memory is to be managed, because there is a sequence of presentation elements. This claim also dictates how an application program is supposed to use the data, because the elements are to be presented one after the other. Accordingly, this claim does not constitute printed matter under the Lowry case.

In the following claim listing, Applicants have marked physical interrelationships in memory with *italics* and dictations of functioning of application programs in **bold**.

> 30. The presentation program portion of Claim 28, wherein *the sub-presentation program segment comprises a group of presentation elements* **which are programmed to be presented simultaneously with respect to each other.**

31. The presentation program portion of Claim 28, wherein **the reference timing specifies the start of the presentation element with respect to the sub-presentation program segment.**

32. The presentation program portion of Claim 28, wherein **the reference timing specifies the duration of the presentation element with respect to the sub-presentation program segment.**

33. The presentation program portion of Claim 28, *wherein the play-out specification includes a location specification specifying a location of the presentation element when presented and wherein the interface program segment provides a location frame of reference relative to which the location specification for the presentation element is specified.*

34. The presentation program portion of Claim 28, wherein **the interface program segment provides a sub-presentation priority specifying a priority with respect to presenting content representative of the sub-presentation program segment.**

Accordingly, as indicated in the special type fonts above, each and every one of the rejected claims independently falls within the criteria specified in Lowry for patentable data structures in memory. The printed matter rejection is therefore inappropriate and should be overturned.

General deficiency of art rejections with respect to 37 CFR 1.104

The art rejections fail to satisfy 37 CFR 1.104 (c) (2)), which states that

> "When a reference is complex ... the particular part relied upon must be designated as nearly as is practicable. The pertinence of each reference, if not apparent, must be clearly explained and each rejected claim specified."

The primary reference is complex. Moorby contains 18 sheets of drawing and 24 columns of text, but the Examiner does not indicate where the recited claim elements of any specific claim are to be found in the reference. Instead, the Examiner paraphrases groups of claims together, without citing any specific language from any claim and then purports to find this conglomerate paraphrase in the reference. The invention is not as the Examiner makes a conglomerate paraphrase. The invention is as claimed.

Applicants have repeatedly pointed out that these rejections are improper and repeatedly requested that the Examiner clarify the rejections. The Examiner has not done so.

Rejection under 35 USC §102: independent claims 28 & 37

Claim 28 recites

> A presentation program portion stored on a computer readable medium, said presentation the program portion comprising :
>
> a sub-presentation programs segment comprising:
>
> a presentation element with a play-out specification indicating how the presentation element is to be played; and

an interface program segment defining a reference timing for the play-out specification, wherein the reference timing is defined independent of the presentation element.

This claim requires a stored portion on a medium to include a segment which in turn includes an element and a segment. This claim defines stored structures within a medium readable by a computer.

Against this claim, the Examiner cites Moorby. Moorby shows a graphical user interface (GUI). Moorby fails to teach or suggest any specific structures stored within a computer readable medium. The Examiner contends that the figures in Moorby illustrate such structures, but that is simply not the case. The figures show images on a screen which might correspond to any structures in memory.

Moreover, the screen itself cannot be considered the relevant medium, because presentation elements and timing references themselves are not in the screen icon. They must be calculated or retrieved elsewhere.

Moreover, since Moorby appears to be an authoring tool, it talks about empowering users to create programming, without indicating precisely what is stored.

Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* case against claim 28.

However, even if the figures in Moorby did correspond to structures in memory, they would fail to teach or suggest the limitations of claim 28. Claim 28 recites that "the reference timing is defined independent of the presentation element." The GUI of Moorby shows the graphical representation of the presentation element integrated with, not independent from, the

graphical representation of the timing information, since the timing information is represented by sizing the representation of the presentation element.

Claim 37 is analogous in scope to claim 28, except that it relates to an information carrier rather than the presentation program portion.

Rejection under 35 USC §102: independent claim 36

Claim 36 recites:

> An apparatus comprising a converter module for amending a coded presentation, the coded presentation comprising:
>
> a sub-presentation program segment comprising:
>
> a presentation element with a play-out specification indicating how the presentation element is to be played; and
>
> an interface program segment defining a reference timing for the play-out specification, wherein the reference timing is defined independent of the presentation element, wherein the converter module is arranged to substitute the sub-presentation by a further sub-presentation comprising a corresponding interface.

Claim 36 is similar in scope to claims 28 and 37, except for the last two lines which specify details of a converter module. The Examiner has not indicated where this converter module is to be found in the reference. Particularly Applicants are unable to find where one sub-presentation is substituted for another, with the further sub- presentation comprising a corresponding interface — this interface being a detail of how things are stored in memory, which is not taught or

suggested by the user interface of Moorby. Therefore this claim distinguishes even more clearly over the reference than the previous ones.

Moorby: independent claim 35

Claim 35 recites:

> A method for playing out a coded presentation on an electronic presentation device, the method comprising the acts of:
>
> playing out at least one sub-presentation which comprises the acts of :
>
> determining a play-out specification for a presentation element based on a timing reference of the sub-presentation that is independent of the presentation element;
>
> playing out the presentation element in accordance with the play-out specification.

This claim is a bit broader than the other independent claims, because it does not set out as many structures stored in a medium. However, the claim still recites that the timing reference is independent of the presentation element. As explained, with respect to claims 28 and 37, the Examiner has failed to indicate where this is allegedly shown in the reference. The GUI interface referred to by the Examiner illustrates timing visually as part of the presentation element. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* case against this claim.

Moorby/Gudmondson: claim 43

The Examiner appears to misconstrue this claim. Claim 43 recites, inter alia, that a multi-

media presentation is stored as a plurality of self-contained sub-presentation data structures. Claim 43 further recites that each data structure includes a play-out specification sub-structure and a plurality of presentation element sub-structures. A play-out specification portion is retrieved from a first location in the data structure. The play-out specification specifies timing behavior of a respective presentation element within the data structure. Responsive to the play-out specification, at least one respective presentation element is retrieved from a second location in the data structure. Applicant respectfully submits that Examiner just stops at the self-contained data structures recited in the first bulleted clause of claim 43 and fails to read the rest of the claim or indicate where the rest of the claim may be found in the reference.

The Examiner cites col. 8, lines 25-67 of Gudmondson. This section does not go into any detail about what is inside the container objects. It just talks about how the objects interact with each other. This section of Gudmondson therefore fails to teach or suggest the particular data structures that are recited in claim 43 and reviewed in the previous paragraph of the present document.

The Examiner then cites Fig. 16 (c) of Gudmondson. This figure, like Moorby, only shows a user interface. It fails to teach or suggest what is going on at a detailed level within the memory or within any data structures.

The Examiner then cites column 16, lines 53+. This section relates to Fig. 1, but Applicants are unable to see any correspondence between this figure and the particular structures recited in claim 43, nor has the Examiner pointed to any.

The Examiner refers to Moorby, figures 11a-c & 12a, but these figures again show the GUI, not what data structures are in memory.

The Examiner cites col. 2, lines 34-36 of Moorby. This section refers to a data file, but does not indicate what structures are stored in it.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness against claim 43.

Claim 44

This claim recites:

> The method of claim 43, comprising accessing a self-contained, sub-sub-presentation data structure ***from within*** the sub-presentation data structure, which sub-sub-presentation data structure comprises at least one play-out specification sub-sub-structure and a plurality of presentation element sub-sub-structures. [emphasis added]

It is not clear what is being referred to in the last paragraph of page 7 of the office action. The Examiner states that he is referring to a claim 43, which is dependent on a claim 42 – but claim 43 is NOT dependent on claim 42. Does the Examiner mean claim 44, which is dependent on claim 43?

With respect to whichever claim, the Examiner cites column 8, line 27, that refers to hierarchical encapsulation. However, this statement alone fails to teach or suggest what precise data structures are used. The containers of Gudmondson are objects, not data structures. Objects contain data structures, but they also contain code. Encapsulating objects fails to teach or suggest what data structures are used.

Moreover, claim 44 recites that the sub-presentation data structure comprises the play-out

specification sub-structure and the presentation element sub-structures. This could not be the same structure as shown in Gudmondson, because one object does not appear to include another there.

Thus the Examiner has failed to present a *prima facie* case of obviousness against claim 44.

Moorby/Gudmondson: claims 33, 41

These claims depend from 28 & 37 and recite:

> the play-out specification includes a location specification specifying a location of the presentation element when presented and wherein the interface program segment provides a location frame of reference relative to which the location specification for the presentation element is specified.

This claim relates to particular structure & content of data in memory.

Like Moorby, Gudmondson is an authoring system. The Examiner has failed to indicate how the Gudmondson reference relates to how program presentation elements are stored for play-out, unlike the present claims. The Examiner points to "containers", but these are merely used for composing a presentation. There is no teaching or suggestion that they are for storage or transmission of program content once the presentation is established.

The Examiner points to Fig. 16(c) as allegedly showing containers or data structures. This figure again shows a graphical user interface, just like the figures the Examiner pointed out in Moorby. This is not a data structure at all.

The Examiner points to column 8, lines 25-67. This is where Gudmondson summarizes

the object-oriented programming scheme. Enclosed with a prior amendment is a definition of object-oriented programming taken from the online Internet dictionary "FOLDOC." This definition explains that objects are data structures encapsulated with routines. For instance, at col. 8, line 43, objects receive messages. These objects are used for programming/authoring content. But what are the details of the insides of these objects? The text pointed to by the Examiner does not say. It only describes them in functional terms, without reference to actual data structures.

Accordingly, the Examiner has not made a *prima facie* case against these claims.

Moorby: claim 38

Claim 38 recites:

> The information carrier of Claim 37, wherein the play-out specification includes a timing specification specifying timing behavior of the at least one presentation element and wherein the interface of the sub-presentation provides a time reference relative to which the timing specification for the at least one presentation element is specified.

This claim relates to details of what is stored on an information carrier. Since the portions of Moorby pointed to by the Examiner relate only to a graphical user interface, as far as Applicants can tell, Moorby fails to teach or suggest these details of what is stored.

Moorby: claim 39 & 31

Claim 39 recites:

The information carrier of Claim 38, wherein the timing specification specifies the start of the at least one presentation element with respect to the time reference of the sub-presentation.

This claim recites further details of what is stored on the information carrier. Again, the portions of Moorby referenced by the Examiner, discuss only what appears on the screen, not what is stored. Accordingly this claim even more clearly distinguishes patentably over the reference as applied.

Claim 31 is similar to claim 39.

Moorby: claims 40 & 32

Claim 40 recites:

The information carrier of Claim 38, wherein the timing specification specifies the duration of the at least one presentation element with respect to the time reference of the sub-presentation.

This claim recites still further details of what is stored on the information carrier. Again, the portions of Moorby referenced by the Examiner, discuss only what appears on the screen, not what is stored. Accordingly this claim even more clearly distinguishes patentably over the reference as applied.

Claim 32 is similar to claim 40.

Moorby: claim 42, 34

Claim 42 recites:

The information carrier of Claim 37, wherein the interface of the sub-presentation provides a sub-presentation priority specifying a priority with respect to presenting the sub-presentation.

This claim recites that the interface provides a priority for a sub- presentation. It is unclear what the examiner thinks is relevant in Moorby to this recitation. However it appears, at the bottom of page 4 of the office action, that he may be pointing to figure 1 of Moorby. This figure shows only a timeline. It shows nothing about priority of sub- presentations. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* case against this claim.

Claim 34 is similar.

Moorby: claim 29

This claim recites:

The presentation program portion of Claim 28, wherein the sub-presentation program segment comprises a sequence of presentation elements which are programmed to be presented one after the other.

The Examiner has not said where these limitations are to be found in the reference. The Examiner refers to figures 11 and 12 of Moorby which relate to graphical user interfaces, rather than what is stored in memory. Moreover, the user interfaces appear to show a program divided into sub-segments. Applicants are unable to find that segments are further divided into presentation elements when stored. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the Examiner has not made a *prima facie* case with respect to this claim.

Moorby: claim 30

This claim recites

> The presentation program portion of Claim 28, wherein the sub-presentation program segment comprises a group of presentation elements which are programmed to be presented simultaneously with respect to each other.

Again the Examiner has failed to indicate where the limitations of this claim are allegedly to be found in the reference. He refers only generally to columns 11 and 12 of Moorby, not indicating which claim is being considered. In that section, Applicants find reference to various confusing terminology, e.g. "Activation Region", "call spots", "blocking", and so forth. The Examiner has not explained how these relate to the claim. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejection is insufficient.

IX. CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that he has answered each issue raised by the Examiner and that the application is accordingly in condition for allowance. Such allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Anne E. Barschall
Reg. No. 31,089
(914) 332-1019
fax 914-332-7719
March 1, 2004

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited this date with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to

Mail Stop Appeal Brief
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria VA 22313-1450

On 3/1/04 (Mailing Date)
By _____ (Signature)

X. APPENDIX

28. A presentation program portion stored on a computer readable medium, said presentation program portion comprising:

a sub-presentation program segment comprising:

a presentation element with a play-out specification indicating how the presentation element is to be played; and

an interface program segment defining a reference timing for the play-out specification, wherein the reference timing is defined independent of the presentation element.

29. The presentation program portion of Claim 28, wherein the sub-presentation program segment comprises a sequence of presentation elements which are programmed to be presented one after the other.

30. The presentation program portion of Claim 28, wherein the sub-presentation program segment comprises a group of presentation elements which are programmed to be presented simultaneously with respect to each other.

31. The presentation program portion of Claim 28, wherein the reference timing specifies the start of the presentation element with respect to the sub-presentation program segment.

32. The presentation program portion of Claim 28, wherein the reference timing specifies the

duration of the presentation element with respect to the sub-presentation program segment.

33. The presentation program portion of Claim 28, wherein the play-out specification includes a location specification specifying a location of the presentation element when presented and wherein the interface program segment provides a location frame of reference relative to which the location specification for the presentation element is specified.

34. The presentation program portion of Claim 28, wherein the interface program segment provides a sub-presentation priority specifying a priority with respect to presenting content representative of the sub-presentation program segment.

35. A method for playing out a coded presentation on an electronic presentation device, the method comprising the acts of:

playing out at least one sub-presentation which comprises the acts of :

determining a play-out specification for a presentation element based on a timing reference of the sub-presentation that is independent of the presentation element;

playing out the presentation element in accordance with the play-out specification.

36. An apparatus comprising a converter module for amending a coded presentation, the coded presentation comprising:

a sub-presentation program segment comprising:

a presentation element with a play-out specification indicating how the

presentation element is to be played; and

an interface program segment defining a reference timing for the play-out specification, wherein the reference timing is defined independent of the presentation element, wherein the converter module is arranged to substitute the sub-presentation by a further sub-presentation comprising a corresponding interface.

37. An information carrier comprising a coded presentation, said coded presentation comprising:

a sub-presentation program segment comprising:

at least one presentation element, having a corresponding play-out specification indicating how the at least one presentation element is to be played; and

an interface program segment defining a reference timing for the play-out specifications, wherein the reference timing is defined independent of the at least one presentation element.

38. The information carrier of Claim 37, wherein the play-out specification includes a timing specification specifying timing behavior of the at least one presentation element and wherein the interface of the sub-presentation provides a time reference relative to which the timing specification for the at least one presentation element is specified.

39. The information carrier of Claim 38, wherein the timing specification specifies the start of the at least one presentation element with respect to the time reference of the sub-presentation.

40. The information carrier of Claim 38, wherein the timing specification specifies the duration of the at least one presentation element with respect to the time reference of the sub-presentation.

41. The information carrier of Claim 37, wherein the play-out specification includes a location specification specifying a location of the at least one presentation element when presented and wherein the interface of the sub-presentation provides a location frame of reference relative to which the location specification for the at least one presentation element is specified.

42. The information carrier of Claim 37, wherein the interface of the sub-presentation provides a sub-presentation priority specifying a priority with respect to presenting the sub-presentation.

43. A method for playing out a coded multi-media presentation on an electronic presentation device, the method comprising:

- accessing a medium, readable by the device and on which the coded multi-media presentation is stored as a plurality of self-contained, sub-presentation data structures;
- selecting at least one sub-presentation data structure from the medium, which data structure comprises at least one play-out specification sub-structure and a plurality of

presentation element sub-structures, referred to by the play-out specification sub-structure;

- retrieving at least one play-out specification portion from a first location in the data structure, which play-out specification portion specifies timing behavior of at least one respective presentation element within the data structure; and
- responsive to the play-out specification, retrieving the at least one respective presentation element from a second location in the data structure.

44. The method of claim 43, comprising accessing a self-contained, sub-sub-presentation data structure from within the sub-presentation data structure, which sub-sub-presentation data structure comprises at least one play-out specification sub-sub-structure and a plurality of presentation element sub-sub-structures.